



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von DR. EUGEN KÖLBING. II Band. Heilbronn, 1879.¹

The second volume of *Englische Studien* consists of two numbers only.

W. Sattler, *Zur englischen Grammatik*, begins the first. He discusses the two phrases 'My own' and 'Of my own,' and likewise 'The first of January' and 'The first January,'² and illustrates by an abundance of examples.

F. H. Stratmann, *Zum altenglischen Wörterbuche*, has notes on *sþiwen* (*speowen*), *blout*, and the suffix *ild*.

Under the title, *Ein altenglischer Schwank*, Felix Liebrecht brings forward Walter Map's tale, *De Sceva et Ollone mercatoribus* (Dist. IV, cap. 16). He relates, partly in abridgment and partly by extended translations into German, the story of the miser Ollo, whose house in Pavia is entered during his absence by his former partner Sceva; the latter takes possession, cajoles Ollo's wife, gains over servants, neighbors and magistrates by a liberal distribution of money and promises, and by their assistance excludes Ollo from his own house upon the latter's return from his journey, and eventually succeeds in persuading him that he has lost his wits. Liebrecht adduces several parallels, of which the nearest is a comedy entitled *Harrig Niding*, by the Danish dramatist Justesen Ranch (A. D. 1476-1577), republished at Copenhagen in 1876 by S. Birket Smith in Hieronymus Justesen Ranch's *Danske Skuespil og Fuglewise*.

H. Varnhagen continues his *Contributions to the Exegesis and Textual Criticism of Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyrt* from the first volume. Part III, which opens this instalment, contains something over a page of various readings. In Part IV is printed the French text of the passage on the Pater Noster (Ayenb. pp. 98-118), together with that underlying the sections which Zupitza and Wülcker have admitted into their *Reading Books*. Appended notes to these passages touch upon matters of interest.

K. Bøddeker prints a *Versified Rule of St. Benedict* in the Northern Dialect from MS. Cotton. Vesp. A. 25 of the British Museum, from which he drew the *English Songs and Ballads of the XVI century*, communicated in *Jahrb. f. Rom. u. Eng. Lit.* N. F. II 81 ff. He concludes that the present version dates from the beginning of the XV century, but is itself the copy of a somewhat older original. An investigation into the language is reserved for a succeeding number of this same volume.

F. Lindner contributes an interesting monograph on *The Tale of Gamelyn*. The editors of *Chaucer* have generally agreed that it was spurious, yet, with

¹ See A. J. P., vol. I, pp. 225-232.

² i. e. '1st Jan.' never read as it is written. See A. J. P., vol. I, p. 89.—B. L. G.

the exception of Tyrwhitt and Hertzberg, they have lacked the courage to exclude it from the Canterbury Tales. (Here, as at the very beginning of the paper, Tyrwhitt comes in for the praise which of late has been but grudgingly bestowed.) Lindner rejects the hypothesis that Chaucer wrote and inserted the tale as a parody upon current ballads; Chaucer is too much in sympathy with the people to cast ridicule upon their heroes. The metre, and the frequent exhortations to be silent and attentive, show that the ballad was originally designed for recitation. The peculiarities of rhyme, alliteration and language are convincing evidence of its popular origin. It probably belonged to the imitations of the Robin Hood ballad poetry, and is to be assigned to the XIII century.

In a note to a passage in the Old English Poem of the Childhood of Jesus, Reinhold Köhler furnishes some curious illustrations of a legend forming part of the poem above mentioned, and first printed by Horstmann in his *Altenglische Legenden*, Paderborn, 1875. To this E. Kölbing adds another illustration from Cod. Harl. 3904 of the British Museum, first described by Wülcker in the *Jen. Literaturzeitung*, 1875, p. 871.

F. H. Stratmann has a short note on æ in Layamon, which he suspects may denote the sound *d* in certain cases, though it usually stands for A. S. æ, *e* and *ea*.

Under the heading, Corrections to Old English Texts, Stratmann also reprints a few improved readings from vols. XI and XII of *Notes and Queries*, Series 4.

Witte, in an article on the Semi-Saxon (Neuenglischsächsische) Pronoun, exhibits the condition of the personal, reflexive, possessive and demonstrative pronouns during the period 1100-1250. Only a few points can be noticed in this review. *pe* is found dialectically for *pu*, as in the Ayenbite. *pou* replaces *pu* in the later MS. of Layamon, the B-text. *You* does not occur as nom. in Semi-Saxon. The A-text of Layamon has *wit*, *uncker* and *incker* as relics of the dual, but they have disappeared from B. *She* is derived from *seo*, the *scae* of the A. S. Chronicle being disregarded. Beowulf 2021 ff. and Jul. 258 are quoted as affording examples of the demonstrative with the force of the personal pronoun. The dat. sing. masc. and fem. of the third personal pronoun is banishing the acc., *hine* disappearing before *him*, and *hi*, *heo* before *hire*. *pai* (*tai*) is clearly a personal pronoun in the *Wohunge of ure Lauerd*.

In Lay. I 34 and I 136 *self* must be construed as a substantive. *Ourselves* and *yourselves* appear neither in A nor B of Layamon. The dative of the pers. pron. with *self* occurs even in A. S., as in Beow. 954, Gen. 611, Christ IV 113, Beow. 1839. The possessive is used in forming the reflexive only in the first and second pers. sing., and here not exclusively. For the third pers. and for the plural of the first and second pers. the dative is employed.

The *mi* and *thi* of *mi self* and *thi self* are not to be regarded as genitives of the pers. pron., but as possessives. Witte refers to the example from S. Basil given Mätzner II, 11, as proof of the substantive use of *sylf* in A. S.: And hæfdon ealles gewæld ge heora ægenes sylfes on eallum pingum. It is not to be denied that the Semi-Saxon appears in certain cases to have lost the consciousness that *self* was a substantive, but such uncertainty was only natural in this transitional stage.

It occurs for the later possessive *its* as early as the poem edited by Morris and by him entitled *The Pearl* (E. E. T. S. 1):

108. Lorde, dere watz hit adubbement, etc.

Under the demonstratives it may be remarked that Witte quotes from the *Ancren Riwe* to show the existence of *pis* used predicatively, referring to a plural subject, as, for example, p. 76:

pis beoð sein Gregories wordes.

J. Caro treats of *The Historical Elements in Shakspeare's Tempest and Winter's Tale*, and ingeniously connects these two plays with the account of a voyage made to the Prussian coast of the Baltic in 1390 by Henry, Earl of Derby, afterwards Henry IV of England. His chief authority for details respecting the expedition is Henry's treasurer, Richard Kingston, whose account-book has been preserved, and is accessible in *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum* II 789. Though the foundation is slender, his theory is constructed with much skill and expounded with admirable clearness.

Ed. Tiessen furnishes on p. 185, and again on p. 440, a number of Contributions to the Determination and Exegesis of the Text of Shakspeare. They form the continuation of a series published in Herrig's *Archiv*, and are in the nature of emendations to the text of Delius's fourth edition of Shakspeare's works.

These papers, which are not concluded in the present volume, refer to thirteen plays in all. The first, beginning on p. 185, takes up in succession *Love's Labours Lost*,¹ *The Merchant of Venice*, *King Richard II*, *King John*, and *Much Ado about Nothing*; the second, pp. 440-475, is devoted to *King Henry IV*, parts I and II, *King Henry V*, *As You Like It*, *Julius Caesar*, *Measure for Measure*, *Timon of Athens*, *Antony and Cleopatra*. Many of the corrections will seem superfluous to the English student of Shakspeare, and not a few depend upon erroneous conceptions of the meaning of phrase or context, although this opinion would by no means hold of all.

Felix Bobertag concludes his article on *Pope's Rape of the Lock*, begun in the first volume of this journal. Pope is considered as the representative of a school which at present has but few admirers, and an attempt is made to understand the principles and methods of that school, and the causes for the disfavor into which it has fallen.

Some seventy pages at the close of this number are taken up with book notices. Wilhelm Viëtor criticises the second edition of Bernhard Schmitz's *Encyclopädie des philologischen Studiums der neueren Sprachen*, hauptsächlich der französischen und englischen, and finds little to recommend. F. Lindner reviews the second edition of Fiedler's *Wissenschaftliche Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, as edited by Kölbing. Lindner qualifies his praise by objecting to the arrangement of the matter, which is substantially the same as in the first edition of 1849.

Kölbing has a favorable notice of Karl Körner's *Einleitung in das Studium des Angelsächsischen*, *Erster Theil: Angelsächsische Formenlehre, Heil-*

¹ Which the author prefers to *Love's Labour's Lost* on the analogy of *Love Labours Won*.

bronn, 1878. Carl Abel's *Die englischen Verba des Befehls*, Berlin, 1878, is noticed by David Asher. Rich. Koppel bestows nearly eleven pages upon Karl Elze's *William Shakspeare*, Halle, 1876.

A. Tanner, *Die Sage von Guy von Warwick*, Heilbronn, 1877, is approvingly noticed by Kölbing. *Beowulf*, Traduit par L. Botkine, Havre, 1877, is considerably treated by Karl Körner, though he cannot help remarking upon the translator's lack of thorough philological training. Zupitza's edition of *Cyne-wulf's Elene* is examined in detail by Karl Körner, who ends with an exhortation to Zupitza upon the teaching of historical English. Under the heading, *Zur englischen Litteraturgeschichte*, II, Kölbing notices Leopold Katscher's translation into German of Taine's *History of English Literature*, and follows with a review of *Anglia*, numbers I and II of the first volume. The cordial spirit of the latter is especially noticeable, and conveys a sound reproof to those who delight in an exhibition of *odium philologicum*.

Several school-books for the learning of English are reviewed under the heading *Lehr- und Übungsbücher für die englische Sprache*, and the book notices of this number close with a few words upon the fourth edition of Moritz Retsch's *Outlines to Shakspeare's dramatic works*, Leipzig, 1878. The number ends with the department of *Miscellanea*, of which the most important article is an obituary notice of Heinrich Leo, contributed by Moritz Heyne. The catalogue of *Lectures on English Philology* at the German Universities is interesting and serviceable, and the system of journal reports is begun, with a promise of future extension.

II. The second number of the volume begins with an investigation by Kölbing into the sources of the Middle English poem *Amis and Amilloun*, in which he continues the researches already published in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge*, IV 282 ff. In the former article Kölbing had sought to prove that the English text (E) was based upon a French original, *Amys et Amillyoun*, contained in a London MS (L). Ten Brink, in his *History of English Literature*, pp. 313-5, refers the English poem to the French *chanson de geste* *Amis et Amiles*, and in a private letter, quoted by Kölbing in this paper, broaches a novel view of his own, namely, that L is based upon E, and not, as Kölbing assumes, E upon L. Kölbing now draws further conclusions from a MS. (C) of the Grand Ducal Library at Carlsruhe, containing a better French text than L. Admitting that all the difficulties are not cleared up, he remains, except for some trifling modifications of detail, true to his former opinion.

Henry Sweet, treating of some of the sources of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, proves quite conclusively that at least two entries, those under 473 and 584, are of a distinctly poetical character, as evinced by the alliteration and the use of a poetical instead of a prosaic word for 'booty.' Perhaps certain other entries, notably those under the years 457, 491, and 501, are to be classed with the foregoing, but the evidence is less satisfactory.

The same scholar, under the head of *Old English Etymologies*, communicates explanations of *beohata* and *gārsecg*. The former he interprets as 'beehater,' i. e. 'bear,' as he would understand *Beowulf* to mean the same animal. *Gārsecg* is identified with *gasric*, a word occurring in a Runic couplet with the same meaning. *Gasric*, accentuated thus: *gásric*, might correspond to the stem of the Norse verb *geisa*, 'to chafe, rage,' with the affix *-ric*.

F. H. Stratmann, in *Notizen zur altenglischen Grammatik*, proposes a new explanation of A. S. *ea* = Gothic *au*, and calls attention to the occurrence of *sc* for *s* in English, particularly that of the region of Warwickshire, between 1200 and 1470.

E. Kölbing follows with a collation of Turnbull's edition of *Sir Beves of Hamtoun* (Edinburgh, 1838) with the Auchinleck MS. upon which it is based.

F. Lindner continues the examination of *The Tale of Gamelyn*, begun on p. 94 of the first number. After investigating the grammatical and dialectical peculiarities of each of the MSS. containing the tale, Lindner finds that the original text was probably composed in the northern part of the West Midland district about the close of the thirteenth century.

K. Böldeker furnishes a wellnigh exhaustive treatment of *The Language of the Rule of St. Benedict*, as a contribution to the knowledge of the Northumbrian dialect. In this he fulfills the promise made on p. 60, *supra*. Taking his initiative from Ellis's *Early English Pronunciation* and Sweet's *History of English Sounds*, he determines the values of several diphthongal combinations and simple vowels, to which he subjoins remarks upon the consonants, the accent, and the toneless final *e*. The inflections are well worked out in twenty-three pages more, and are followed by syntactical observations on the Use of the Subjunctive, the Omission of the Pronominal Subject, and the Infinitive.

W. Sattler, *Zur englischen Grammatik*, shows by numerous examples that such expressions as *two and a half inches*, where both the integer and the fraction precede the noun, are, partly through German influence, beginning to replace the older *two inches and a half*, where the integer precedes and the fraction follows the noun. As a supplement to his paper in the first number, Sattler quotes examples of various modes of writing dates from Queen Victoria's *Leaves from the Journal of Our Life in the Highlands* and Theodore Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort*.

Ueber drei Ralegh'sche Schriften is the title of an interesting paper by A. Buff. Three tractates attributed to Ralegh, and no doubt written by his hand, are shown to be mere translations or adaptations of certain French and Italian works. The first, *Observations concerning the Causes of the Magnificency and Opulency of Cities*, consists mainly of extracts from Botero's *Tre libri delle cause della grandezza e magnificenza delle città*, Venetia, 1589. The second, *The Cabinet Council containing the Chief Acts of Empire, etc.*, is pieced together out of Bodin's *Six Livres de la Republique*, Paris, 1577, Machiavelli's *Principe*, and his *Discorsi sopra la prima Deca di Tito Livio*. The third, *The Prince or Maxims of State*, is somewhat more original, but owes much to the three treatises last mentioned.

R. Mosen contributes an article on Nathaniel Lee's *Life and Works*. A view of his life and poetical genius is followed by a survey of his plays in their chronological order. Mosen makes out three periods of his activity as dramatic poet, viz: 1675-6, 1677-1681, 1684-1690.

Tiessen's Contributions, already noticed above, occupy the remaining pages of this number, with the exception of Book Notices and Miscellanea.

The Book Notices comprise a review by K. Maurer of Ignaz Jastrow's *Zur strafrechtlichen Stellung der Sklaven bei Deutschen und Angelsachsen*, and of Hertzberg's edition of *The Libell of English Policye*, Schipper's *englische Alexiuslegenden*, the fourth edition of Diez's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, together with Urban Jarnick's Index to the same, Holt's revision of White's *Ormulum*, Böddeker's *Altenglische Dichtungen der MS. Harl. 2253*, Leo's *Four Chapters of North's Plutarch*, and Baskerville's *The Poetry of Germany*, by various critics. The departments of *Lehr- und Uebungsbücher* and *Miscellanea* contain nothing of much general interest except Kölbing's note on Chaucer's *Knights Tale*.

ALBERT S. COOK.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. 1880.

Janvier 1. Notice sur les Caractères Phéniciens destinés à l'impression du *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. (Ph. Berger.) After pointing out the insufficiency of the Hebrew characters to represent the Phoenician language, M. Berger gives a sketch of the history of Phoenician typography, from the discovery of the alphabet and language by the Abbé Barthélemy, announced in 1758, to the alphabets of Bodoni, Parma, 1808 and 1818, the Imperial Press, Vienna, the Duc de Luynes, 1846, and de Saulcy, 1847, and shows that their imperfections demanded a new set of types for the projected *Corpus Inscriptionum*. The National Press will have four new Phoenician fonts, two of the older and two of the later character; it will probably not attempt separate types for the Neo-Punic, which is too irregular to be manageable by the printer. For Hebrew it returns to the monumental font of Robert Étienne (Stephens), which was discovered in looking over the older specimens for a suitable character, and of which an exact copy has been made.

2. Notes de lexicographie assyrienne. Third article (St. Guyard). The author defends the following significations: *tabrāt*, 'lodging'; *igug*, 'to be angry' (correction of his former view, § 40); *ṣuṣu*, 'reed, rush' (correction); the concluding formula in exorcisms against demons: 'remember the oath of heaven' (after Halévy); *ilāniṣu iṣtarātiṣa amnā ana zakikī* (Ass. p. 230), 'his gods and his goddesses I have destined to be broken'; *zakiku* = 'fragment' (after Halévy); *enat* (A. L., p. 81, l. 28-29) Kal pass. partcp. fem. of *enu*, 'to change, infringe, transgress,' and *uṣṭepil* (ib.) from *pīlu*, 'transgress'; *iriṣu* (deluge-text, A. L., p. 86, l. 49), 'odor' (with Fox Talbot, against Smith who takes *iru* = 'odor,' and Delitzsch, who renders 'friendly desire'); the form *uṣṣumu* as an infin. Kal of Assyrian verbs ܐܪܥܐ; *ṣir*, 'field'; the stem *ba'ar*, 'hunting and fishing,' and *būru*, 'cistern, pit'; *atabbu*, 'basin, watering-place'; *miṣari*, *uṣāti* (Sayce's Sennach. p. 2), 'protection, assistance'; Pael and Safel of *parak*, 'to act in such and such a manner, execute, do'; *iddiṣu*, *namrīrru*, *birbiru*, *melamonu*, *ṣibubu*, 'majestic, splendid' (correction after Halévy); *muṣtarḥu*, 'firm, strong, a sovereign'; *dabab*, 'to speak, say'; instead of the problematical *itāt* read *idāt* (plu. of *id*, 'hand'), 'alongside of.'

Nouvelles et Mélanges. C. Imbault-Huart describes some recent English and French translations of modern popular Chinese poetry, and Chinese and English newspapers at Peking and Shanghai, and notices favorably Father A. Zotolli's *Cursus litteraturae sinicae neomissionariis accommodatus*, Shanghai, 1879. L. Feer speaks of R. N. Cust's *Sketch of the Modern Languages of the East Indies*, London, 1878, as a useful compilation. N. Siouffi, French Vice-consul at Mosul, gives the outline of a conversation held by him in Oct. 1879 with Sheikh Nasser, the religious head of the Devil-worshiping sect called Yezidis, whose religion forbids learning to read and write, except to one family. E. J. Dillon has a very commendatory notice of Harlez's *Manuel de la langue de l'Avesta*, Louvain, 1879, and Barbier de Meynard a short account of Rieu's excellent Catalogue of the Persian MSS in the British Museum, London, 1879. J. Oppert locates the primitive seat of the Assyrians and the Phenicians in the island of Bahrein in the Persian Gulf. Barbier de Meynard notices briefly the chronicle of Abu Zakaria, edited and translated by E. Musqueray (of whose work the reviewer speaks unfavorably), Paris, 1879.

Février-Mars-Avril. 1. La Coupe Phénicienne de Palestrina, et l'une des sources de l'art et de la mythologie helléniques (Ch. Clermont-Ganneau), 3d article. This article describes the gilt silver medallion of the cup, namely the form and posture of the three men and the two dogs; the author conjectures a relation between this scene and those of the circumscribed zones, but offers no explanation.

2. Étude sur quelques peintures et sur quelques textes relatifs aux funérailles. (G. Maspero). This is a careful study and lively description of the Theban Egyptian funeral rites from the monuments, the construction of the coffin, the furnishing of the tomb, the construction of the funeral bark, the procession, the lamentations and the voyage across the Nile to the Place of the Tombs (emblem of the voyage of the soul after death to the judges of the lower world). The author takes occasion to correct the statement of Diodorus Siculus that the mummy encountered, beyond the sacred lake of the nome, forty-two judges, who examined the character of the deceased, and allowed the body to pass only when he was found to be free from crime; this, says Maspero, is a confounding of the ceremonies of interment with the mystical sense that the Egyptians attached to them. The monuments tell nothing of earthly judges; but the Nile was a symbol of the 'lake of the West,' which separated the human from the divine world, beyond which the soul met the forty-two judges of the infernal jury.

3. Des Origines du Zoroastrisme. (C. de Harlez). 5th article. The author continues his attack on the storm-myth theory (*oragism*) by an examination of some important Avestan doctrines: the Fravashis, originally the old Aryan divinized souls of the dead, became later guardian genii of men or attendants on gods, on celestial genii or even on abstract beings (this latter view being borrowed from the Accadian mythology), and their guardianship has nothing to do with storms, and has no resemblance to the Sumerian spirits; the inferior evil genii, the Yâtus, Pairikas and others, are simply wicked and hurtful spirits, and do not need the lightning to explain them (Harlez ridicules the attempt to connect Pairika and Apsaras etymologically); the elevated morality and pure

spirituality of the Mazdean eschatology, strict rewards and punishments after death, victory over the evil spirits, final restoration of the world to virtue and happiness, and the resurrection of the dead, have nothing to do with the storm, and the molten metal which traverses and purifies hell and destroys the Serpent, is the metal of the mountains, and not the lightning, the terrible plague produced by the demon Malkōs is not an air-storm, but a cold winter; Zoroaster resists all attempts to reduce him to a storm-hero, he is not even an old Aryan storm-hero Mazdaically reconstructed, although he smiled at his birth (lightning), lived for thirty years on milk and cheese (cloud-cows), and was tempted by Anromainyus to abjure the law of Ahura (the Vedic Sarama solicited by the storm-demons to abandon her heavenly masters); the argument from the 19th Fargard of the Avesta, to the effect that the temptation (battle between good and bad spirits, air-storms) is immediately followed by a conversation between Zarathustra and Ahura-Mazda (revelation-descent of lightning), and that these are therefore both storm-myths, falls, because there is nothing in the Fargard about storms, and its two parts have no connection one with the other (also the Vedic *vāc* is the personification of speech in general, and not thunder); the Eranian legends, such as Zoroaster's bestowment of immortality on Vistāspa's son, and the promulgation of the Mazdean law by the bird Karshiya, are only by violence brought into connection with the phenomena of the air. Harlez maintains that the storm-theory rests on baseless assertions and erroneous text-interpretations, and obstructs the progress of correct explanation. The Avesta, he says, contains no word for lightning or thunder; and the theory in question ignores the true nature of the beliefs and institutions of Persia and the other Aryan peoples.

4. Matériaux pour l'histoire de la numismatique et de la métrologie Musulmanes, traduits ou recueillis et mis en ordre. (H. Sauvaire, Consul de France). First part, Coins (continued). The coins treated are the derham, the dāneq (one-sixth of a derham), the qīrāt (one-twentieth of a derham), the tassūj (one-fourth of a daneq), the kharrūba (carob-grain, of varying weight), the habba (grain, reckoned at two grains of barley), aruzza (grain of rice—40 or 48 of them make a daneq), and the fels, of varying value, originally one-fortyeighth of a derham, and itself divided into four pieces (qeta); interesting particulars concerning the origin, designations and history of these are given by the author, with full references to native authorities.

5. Note sur la forme du tombeau d'Eschmounazar. (de Vogüé). From personal observation of the tomb de Vogüé offers the following explanation of some terms in the inscription: *maḥom* is the ensemble of the monument, including the sepulchre, the vault, and perhaps a small exterior building; *heber* is the sepulchre, which contains the sarcophagus; *helet* is a movable hollow object, the box or receptacle of the sarcophagus; *mishkab* is the funereal couch, the sarcophagus; *ālūt*, a difficult word, probably the vaulted space that covers in the sarcophagus. Lines 3-6 would then read: 'I rest in this coffin, in this sepulchre, in the monument that I have built . . . let no one carry off the coffin of my sarcophagus, let no one burden me in this sarcophagus with the vaulted chamber of a second sarcophagus.'

6. Étude sur les inscriptions de Piyadasi. (Senart). After a sketch of the history of the decipherment and interpretation of the inscriptions, and the

presentation of examples going to show that in all the texts the long and nasalized vowels are always and the *am* and *u* frequently identical, together with special transcriptions in the particular groups (such as *thi* instead of *sti*, *k* instead of *ky*, and a series of *r*-ligatures), Senart proceeds to the detailed examination of the various texts. His plan is to print the original of any given inscription from the best text, with his transcription (he finds that of the *Corpus Inscr. Ind.* unsatisfactory), followed by the transcriptions of the other texts. His first chapter is on 'the fourteen edicts and the detached edicts of Dhauli.' For the first edict (against the slaughter of animals for food) he prints the Girnar text, and adds a verbal commentary on it and the others. *Dhamma* (= *dharma*) he takes in the sense of 'positive religion'; Prinsep's rendering of *samāja*, 'convivial meeting,' he rejects, and holds that the word somehow or other comes to the sense of 'the destruction of life'; in the form *dharmadipi* (facsimile W of the Kapur di Giri text) he finds a confirmation of Burnell's conjecture that *lipi* is a Sanskrit appropriation of the old Persian *dipi*.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. H. C. characterizes Father Violette's Dictionnaire Sâmoa-Français-Anglais et Français-Sâmoa-Anglais as a very important contribution to Oceanic philology. In reference to the attacks on Dr. Wells Williams's Chinese dictionary by Chalmers and Giles, Imbault-Huart says that, though it contains many mistranslations, it is nevertheless the best Chinese-European lexicon in existence. He notices favorably Gonsalves's Lexicon Manuale Latino-Sinicum, Peking, 1879, Möllendorff's Family Law of the Chinese, Shanghai, 1879, and Piry's edition of the Saint Édît, *ibid.*; the value of the first number of Jametel's L'Épigraphie Chinoise au Tibet, Peking, 1879, which gives Tibet from an exclusively Chinese point of view, he says is diminished by the author's non-acquaintance with the Mongol and Tibet languages. Barbier de Meynard commends Stanislas Guyard's Manuel de la langue persane vulgaire, Paris, 1880, to travelers as a convenient handbook.

Mai-Juin. 1. Étude sur quelques peintures et sur quelques textes relatifs aux funérailles. (G. Maspero). This concluding article gives the ceremonies at the tomb—the mummy receives the last adieux of the family, and the women chant their lamentations. Maspero gives the curious funeral oration (Leyden MS. I, 371), in which a husband reproaches his wife for dying and leaving him; he has been able to fix some phrases heretofore undecipherable, from a copy furnished by M. Wilbour; the oration, he thinks, is juridical, possibly intended to lay the wife's ghost. In the description of the ceremonies of the funeral banquet he gives the traditional harper's song (on the transitoriness of life), correcting and filling out the text of the Harris Papyrus, No. 500, from two inscriptions. The article concludes with a short statement of the Egyptian view of the constitution of man: the part that remains on earth after death, called the *ka* or 'double' was at first conceived of as hardly less material than the visible body; later, the conception becoming less gross, but the earthly representative being regarded as having the properties of matter, it was termed *bāi*, 'material,' or, regarded as a flame, called 'the luminous,' *khou*. These various conceptions continued to exist side by side, and were worked up by the priests into a system or dogma, so that towards the XVIII dynasty they divided the human person into two parts, of two sections each: the *body* with

its *double*, both of which remained in the tomb, and the *material soul* which served as body to the *luminous*, and accompanied it in its transformations and successive existences. The fuller explanation of these conceptions Maspero reserves for a future paper.

2. Matériaux pour l'histoire de la numismatique et de la métrologie Musulmanes. (H. Sauvaire). The author continues his enumeration of coins, concerning which he gives a very large number of valuable quotations from native writers.

3. Étude sur les inscriptions de Piyadasi. (Senart), second article. This treats the second edict (declaration by Piyadasi that he has introduced, into his territory and that of the neighboring peoples, plants, fruits and wells for men and beasts), and the third (order to magistrates to teach the people obedience to parents and elders, almsgiving to brahmans and çramaṇas, respect for all life, and avoidance of prodigality and violent language). In the aramāne of the Kapur di Giri text of the 2d edict, Khālsi alamāne, Senart finds Ariana ('in the territory of Antiochus, king of the Greeks, and also of the kings near him in Ariana'), a geographical term hitherto not met with. This article, like the preceding, is full of valuable discussion, in which the author has constant regard to the work of his predecessors, Wilson and Kern.

4. Notes de lexicographie Assyrienne. (St. Guyard), 4th article. The article contains a number of detached observations, among them the assignment of the signification 'mausoleum, tomb,' to *kimahu*, the reference of the preposition *but* 'near' to a noun *būtu* meaning 'thorax' (the *ṭ* being often in Assyrian viciously replaced by *t*), and the announcement of a new verb, the root *zāḥu*, 'to displace.'

Nouvelles et Mélanges. There are several noteworthy papers attached to the Proceedings of the Société Asiatique. Clermont-Ganneau suggests that the Phoenician-Cyprian divine name, pronounced by him Pummai, should be compared with Shaddai for the signification. Oppert inclines to identify Nabonassar with Tiglathpileser, and thinks it probable that the era of Nabonassar, Feb. 26th, pertains to the year, and not to the day of the Babylonian epoch, the 26th of Feb. is merely the first of Toth of the year 576 of the Sothiac cycle (in the calculation of Hipparchus) and the year proper began twenty-four days later, on the first of Nisan (22 March). Guyard offers an interpretation of the final formula of malediction in the inscriptions of Van. Certain documents which have been supposed to exhibit the commercial transactions of a Babylonian banking-house, called Egibi Sons (B. C. 800-400), Oppert maintains to be juridical records in which appear men of the tribe of Egibi, and in which he also finds data for fixing the relations of the Babylonian cubic measures to one another; the unit is the *ka* = 18 lit. +, and the *gur* = 5860.5 lit.

Août-Septembre. 1. Des Origines du Zoroastrisme. (C. de Harlez), sixth and last article. In this Second Part of his discussion, Harlez gives the positive side of his conception of Zoroastrism, as follows: It is the product neither of storm-myths (these, handed down from the old faith, it transformed, so that they are no longer recognizable), nor of solar myths, nor of the conflict between the Eranians and the Hindus (though hostility to the Hindu religion existed).

The best authority on this point is the Gathas, which, in contrast with other parts of the Avesta, exhibit the pure Mazdean reform; they show Mazdaism persecuted and struggling for life—it was therefore not a simple development of popular beliefs—its object was to abolish the old cultus and beliefs, and to introduce new doctrines, monotheism, governmental and moral dualism, prophetism, religious abstractions, a new cosmogony and eschatology, the Ameshaçpentas, the Fravashis, the Qarenah, incantations, and interdiction of the interment of the dead. Whence came these new beliefs? As a preliminary to answering this question, the date of the Avesta must be fixed as nearly as possible; from allusions in the book itself to certain historical events, from the advanced civilization it indicates, and the decomposition of the language in which it is written, and from a comparison of the intellectual conditions of other peoples, the Greeks, for example, it appears that it cannot be put earlier than the period of Darius Hystaspis (though its legends may belong to a more ancient time)—in the time of Darius it controlled only a part of Eran, the Persians had not accepted it. As to the origin of Mazdaism: it retained the principal ceremonies of the old Eranian cultus, and many of the old legends; it borrowed from the Turanians demonology, incantations, the worship of the stars and part of its fire-worship, funeral practices (as those relating to defilement by dead bodies), the interior hell with its western gate and mountain, the Fravashis, spirits of the gods and of material beings, and various scattered characteristics; it shaped for itself dualism proper, the celestial hierarchy, a cosmogony and eschatology, systematized the data furnished by Eran and Turan, and idealized what it had inherited from naturalism; it had in common with Judaism monotheistic principles, creation, the moral side of dualism, demonism, and prophetism—whether it invented or borrowed these latter conceptions, science is not now in position to say—it is improbable that Judaism borrowed them from Mazdaism, for they, together with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, appear in the former earlier than they can be found in the latter. Whether Zarathustra is a myth, or an ancient sage, or a sacerdotal title transformed into a proper name, it is impossible to determine. But Mazdaism could not have been the work of a single man—its apostles were the magi. Darius, as the Behistun inscription states, reëstablished the temples and rites of the viçs, not the Mazdean religion which had no temples; the magi had abolished not Mazdaism but the worship of the gods. The apparent difficulty here is explained by the fact that there were two classes of magi, the one Eranizing or Eranized, the other Chaldaizing or Turanian. The religious history of the Eranians, then, is this: Arrived at the southeast of the Caspian, they came in contact with a Medic (?) people, whose doctrines they in part adopted—the resulting mixture of opinions was shaped and formulated by a man of genius or a powerful priestly body—at first a sweeping reform was made, but old traditions forced their way in, and so Avestan Mazdaism arose, with its variations and contradictions. Harlez's articles on Zoroastrism are published in book-form by E. Leroux, Paris.

2. *Élégie sur les malheurs de l'Arménie, et le martyre de Saint Vahan de Kogthen.* (J. A. Gatteyras). This is the first complete translation of an Armenian text published by the Mechitarists of San Lazzaro, Venice, in their Armenian Historical Library, Venice, 1853-1861. It details the sufferings of

Armenia under the Arab domination in the eighth century of our era, and describes the life and death of the popular Saint Vahan. Such translations are welcome as throwing light on the obscure history of that time, especially on the relations of the Armenian bishops and nobles to their conquerors.

3. Étude sur les inscriptions de Piyadasi. (Senart), third article. Commentary on the fourth and fifth edicts, the former of which states the happy results of the king's efforts in behalf of religion, and the latter announces the appointment of overseers or superintendents of religion, who are to occupy themselves with the adherents of all the sects, at home and among the frontier populations. A photographic reduction (four-fifths size) of Cunningham's facsimile of the Kapur di Giri inscriptions is appended.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. C. Imbault-Huart gives Chinese Miscellanies—anecdotes, bons mots, novels and maxims—the first of a series of translations designed to present a general view of Chinese literature, and for this new Chinese Department of the *Journal* he invites contributions from all quarters. There is a brief mention of the edition of Tabari now coming out at Leyden under the editorship of twelve distinguished Arabists, de Goeje having the general direction, of which a good part has already appeared.

Octobre—Novembre—Décembre. 1. Senart's fourth article gives the Piyadasi inscriptions VI–XII, in which the king declares his zeal in the administration of justice, in healing dissensions among the clergy, and in procuring the happiness of his people; announces liberty to all sects, since even those men who fail in almsgiving are not without other virtues; says that in place of the chase and similar amusements he now occupies himself with deeds of beneficence; over against ordinary social customs commends religious practices as securing happiness in the future life; affirms that glory is valueless unless the people follow his religion, which requires strenuousness; and exhorts the sects to have charity one toward another that they may all attain to an inward unity of pure religion.

2. Bibliographie Ottomane. Notice des livres Turcs, Arabes et Persans, imprimés à Constantinople, durant la période 1294–1296 de l'hégire (1877–1879). (Cl. Huart). In continuation of the valuable bibliographical communications of the late M. Belin, interpreting secretary of the French embassy at Constantinople, Huart gives a list (which he does not offer as complete) of Turkish publications during the years named, following Belin's five divisions: theology, religious sciences, legislation; literature, morals, poetry; history, biography; miscellaneous (geographical, mathematical, encyclopedic, etc.); linguistic science, composition, grammar; and there is added a list of works published at Beirut, with which are to be compared the catalogues of the American Mission press, and the Jesuit press of that city. The Constantinople list shows considerable activity, notwithstanding the interruptions caused by war; among the books are a good many translations of French novels (those of J. Verne and others), besides French and Greek grammars, and the Koran literature is respectable. We are glad to see this valuable work resumed; its value would be increased by brief indications, so far as possible, of the literary or scientific worth of the books named; dates are generally and prices frequently given.

3. Sur la véritable signification de la notation numérique inventée par Aryabhata. (Léon Rodet.) The object of this article is to show the bearing of Aryabhata's special notation on the question of the origin of our decimal system of figures. The view of Prinsep and Woepcke, that it is a Hindu invention transmitted to Europe by the Arabians, was opposed by Ed. Thomas on the grounds that the old Hindu system, before the eighth century of our era, had different figures to express the units, the tens, the hundreds, the thousands, and probably the other orders, and that though some of these figures resemble certain letters of the writing in which they occur, these letters are not at all the initials of the names of the corresponding numbers; and it has since appeared that in the Açoka-character the numeral figures, though only slightly different from those of seven centuries later, bear no resemblance to the letters of this character. It has been further objected against the Indian origin that Aryabhata invented for his own use a special notation, which he would not have done if he had known this decimal system. Rodet has before, in his translation of the second chapter of the *Aryabhaṭīyam*, argued from the author's rules for the extraction of square and cube roots, that he had command of a decimal system essentially the same as ours. He now explains A's peculiar system (which makes the five first classes of the Sanskrit alphabet signs of units, from 1 to 25, including of course two tens, and the two last classes signs of tens, from 30 to 100) shows that it was invented by him solely for the purpose of putting his astronomical tables into condensed metrical form (he uses it indeed only for the tables in his first chapter), and that this argument, therefore, against a Hindu decimal notation is to be left out of the discussion. He thinks that A. used a column-table, abacus, in writing his numbers, and that the centenary system employed some centuries earlier by the princes of India was based on the hieratic numeration, such as is found in the Rhind papyrus, published by Eisenlohr, in which the units and tens have different signs, and the hundreds and thousands the same. In an appendix he gives authority for writing the name of his author with one *l*.

4. Études Buddhiques. Comment on devient Buddha. (Léon Feer). From the first ten texts of the *Avadāna-Āṭaka* Feer describes the five steps in the process of attaining the dignity of Buddha, the meeting, the offering to the Buddha, the vow or aspiration of the seeker, the luminous, sanctifying smile of the Buddha, and his prediction of the worshipper's future; to which he adds an account of the ten heroes of the texts treated, the instructions given by the Buddha in order to produce desire and aptitude for the Bodhi, and the relation between the ranks of the Buddha and the inferior Arhat.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. The Chinese Miscellanies contains several interesting historical and religious papers, an episode of the insurrection in Chinese Turkestan in 1865, a Buddhist ceremony in China, a visit to the temple of Confucius at Shanghai, a visit to a religious and scientific establishment near Shanghai, and a collection of unedited reflections and maxims. Darmesteter's translation of the *Vendidad* (one of Müller's series of *The Sacred Books of the East*), Oxford, 1880, is reviewed by Harlez, who finds in it much that he thinks incorrect; these two scholars differ widely in their principles of interpretation of the *Avesta*. De Goeje gives a severe criticism of the first volume

of E. P. Goergens's Arabische Quellenbeiträge zur Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, which is an abridged translation of the second part of Abu Shāma's history of Nureddin and Saladin (The Book of the Two Gardens) with the aid of R. Röhricht; the reviewer cites numerous cases of inaccuracy. The valuable Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, vols. I-IV, London, 1874-1879, is noticed by Mehren.

C. H. Toy.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, XXXV, 2.

1. pp. 157-163.¹ E. Rohde: The Legend of the Nine Sleepers of Sardinia. In Rh. Mus. XXXIII, p. 209, R. called attention to the relation between the heathen story of Epimenides and the Christian legend of the Ephesian Sleepers. He now treats the various phases of this same mythical conception in an acute discussion of Aristot. Phys. Ausc. IV, 11, p. 218, b. 21, and the notes of Philoponus and Simplicius on this passage. Of special interest is the explanation of the striking fact that the popular mythology connected the story (doubtless very old) of a long sleep with the name of Epimenides. R. finds the solution of the difficulty in Max. Tyr. diss. XVI, 1: ἐν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Δεκαλόου τῷ ἀντρώ κείμενος ὑπνῷ βαθεῖ ἐτη συχνά, ὅναρ ἐφ' ἐντυχεῖν αὐτὸς θεοῖς καὶ θεῶν ἐγγόνους [so Markland for λόγους—ἐγγόνους?] καὶ Ἀληθείᾳ καὶ Δίκῃ. That is to say, the *source of the wisdom* of Epimenides was a long sleep in the cave of Zeus on the Cretan Mount Ida. One sees at once the kinship of this story with the well-known legends about Pythagoras. R. concludes as follows: We may now assume more decidedly than before, that a story of sleeping heroes, of kin to the Sardinian legend, existed at Ephesus in heathen times, and that the familiar legend of the Seven Sleepers had its origin in a Christian modification of this older myth.

2. pp. 164-173. O. Apelt: On the Commentary to Plato's Parmenides. Corrections in the text of the Supplement to the Commentary of Proclus. This work has been three times edited (by V. Cousin, Paris, 1820 and 1864, and by G. Stallbaum, Leipzig, 1839). Apelt believes it to have been composed by a single hand and to contain elucidations of sufficient value to repay the labor of restoring the text.

3. pp. 174-190. J. Asbach: The Consulships of the Julian and Claudian Emperors. The writer begins with the contradictory statements in Suetonius (Aug. 26) and Dio (51, 21) about the duration of the consulships of Augustus in the years 31-29 B. C. Then, in order to test the trustworthiness of Suetonius, he examines all the statements made by the latter about the consulships of Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius and Nero, comparing these statements in each case with the inscriptions. The conclusion reached is, that Suetonius is inexact in notices of this sort. A. accordingly accepts the statement of Dio in regard to the years 31-29 B. C. He then attempts to determine the precise duration of each of the five consulships which Augustus held for portions of the year. In this investigation he leaves Suetonius entirely out of account, but finds at the end that Suetonius is certainly not far wrong. The serious

¹ See Am. Journal of Philology, vol. I, No. 2, p. 235.

error of Suetonius consists in saying that Augustus held the office of consul throughout the year only five times: We must now believe he did so eight times. In view of the whole case, A. believes it is better not to attempt to remove the mistake of Suetonius (Aug. 26) by emendation. Instead of following such a method, he would prefer always to bear in mind the careless habit of this historian, to subject all his statements to the most searching criticism, to reject them when unsupported unless inherently probable. At the end A. gives a table showing the duration of each of the consulships of the first five emperors.

4. pp. 191-235. H. Flach: On Hesychius of Miletus. The introductory pages discuss the marks, so to speak, by which, in the biographies which Suidas borrowed from Hesychius, the parts which Suidas himself added or interjected may be recognized. F. shows that these biographies cannot be ascribed to Hesychius in their entirety, and declares his belief that Suidas had more abundant materials at command than is commonly supposed. The investigation which follows is divided into several distinct parts. Two preliminary questions are first treated: (1) The source of the remarks made by Suidas in the first person (e. g. *προεῖπομεν*, s. v. *Φίλων Ἰουδαῖος*), some of which are to be referred to Hesychius. These Suidas copied without change. Eudocia, on the other hand, who has preserved two such remarks of Hesychius, gave up the first person. (2) The question what citations of other writers in these biographies can be proved to belong to Suidas himself and not to Hesychius. In a note F. refutes the current view that Hesychius treated no ecclesiastical writers. After these preliminary discussions one hundred and thirty-seven biographies are examined singly, the attempt being made in each case to show what materials Suidas used and how he used them. Next comes a detailed list of the works earlier than Hesychius to which Suidas had recourse when he failed to find enough for his purpose in Hesychius. Of these works, the Scholia to Aristophanes seem to have been most frequently used. The concluding part of the article is an attempt to settle the dates of Hesychius and the Pseudo-Hesychius. The conclusion in regard to Hesychius is, that he composed his biographical work very late in life under the emperor Heraclius, and that he was born not many years before or after 550. In this connection F. presents an interesting, if not entirely convincing conjecture. He thinks it probable that the elder Hesychius of Miletus, father of the historian, was a grandson of Hesychius of Alexandria, a famous physician and father of Jacobus, also a famous physician. This Jacobus, then, would be the grandfather of our Hesychius. F. calls attention to the favor with which physicians are treated by Hesychius and to the fullness of detail about family matters in the biography of Jacobus. The time of the Pseudo-Hesychius is not to be determined so easily nor so surely. But it is certain that he based his work on Suidas and not on Hesychius. He leaves Hesychius so entirely on one side, that F. concludes he must have had a manuscript of Suidas quite different from the existing ones—one in which the parts composed by Suidas himself were visibly separated from the epitome of Hesychius. F. is inclined to ascribe the Pseudo-Hesychius approximately to the period of Zonaras, but promises a fuller discussion of the matter in the preface to his forthcoming edition of Hesychius.

5. pp. 236-243. F. Leo: The Third Decade of Livy. This article calls attention to the service rendered by the recent edition of Luchs in restoring to their rights the neglected manuscripts of Books XXVI-XXX which are independent of the Puteanus. Luchs has performed a task first accurately described by Mommsen in the *Analecta Liviana*. Leo gives a summary statement of the relations of the manuscripts and then discusses several passages singly. He designates the Codex Puteanus by the letter P, the manuscripts of the family of the Spirensis (first used by Gelenius for the Basle edition of 1535) by Σ. Leo believes, with Luchs, that these two classes of manuscripts have equal value, and that each should be used to correct the errors of the other. XXVI, 49, 12, Leo writes, with Σ, *alia me angit cura . . . muliebris sum, simul et aetate*. For the proper use of *ango* and *stimulo* he refers to XXVI, 40, 2, 7; 47, 5, 8; XXIX, 1, 4; XXX, 11, 3; 14, 1; 36, 10. XXVI, 51, 1, Leo reads, with Σ, *data quinquere me, captivis cum Magone*, and refers to Polybius (X, 19, 8, etc.) for the facts. In P *cum* is corrupted into *que*. XXVII, 7, 1 Leo writes: *cum agmine captivorum*. XXVIII, 7, 10, *omissis Romanis rebus*. XXIX, 1, 2, *ex iis trecentos iuvenes, florentes aetate et virum robore insignes, circa se habebat*. XXIX, 3, 7, Σ has: *sociosque navales in auxilium duxit*. Leo defends in *auxilium* (*auxilium* in its original sense) and suggests the loss of some such word as *adsumptos*. Leo holds that words unintelligible in P, which are wholly omitted in Σ, are to be treated as corruptions of the true reading. So XXIX, 17, 15, *matronas fuit virgines*. Σ omits *fuit*, but it seems to be a corruption of *vitiant*. XXX, 18, 7, *et ut rem permixtus* (so P) etc. Leo restores the passage thus: *et ut semper minus, ut cuspidi uti et comminus, ut gladio posset*, etc. He refers to Cic. C. M. 6, 19; Caes. B. G. VIII, 13; Ov. Met. III, 118. XXX, 29, 4, *maxime si hostis fiduciaque, non*, etc. Leo finds in *si* (lost from Σ) a remnant of *securitate*. XXX, 31, 1: P has: *Hannibal avere adventus tui spem*. Σ has: *Hannibal, adventus tui spe*. Leo conjectures: *Hannibal, ob levem tui spem*, and refers to Polybius XV, 8, 12.

After discussing a few of Luchs's emendations, Leo proposes several of his own. XXVI, 41, 20, *Vexati a Poenis socii*; 41, 21, *eadem in victores ingruit*. XXVII, 1, 8, *terga subsidiantium* (or *opperientium*, so Höfer) *invaderent*; 18, 13, *subierunt*. *primique* simul; 27, 11, *pro veteri prudentia* (so also Σ); 47, 9, *somno ac via illis sternunt*; 50, 1, *Nero ex nocte*. XXVIII, 15, 9, *hostem cerneret*; 33, 16, *ipsi fuerunt*. XXIX, 3, 8, *hominibus* pacis. XXX, 30, 11, *quietis prodest consiliis*; 31, 4, *nostri prius de*; 31, 10, *verba prolata renuntiant*; 42, 7, *responderent ipsi non mite*; 45, 7, *claraque cognomina asciverunt*. Leo also calls attention to several interpolations hitherto unnoticed. XXVII, 13, 4, *die*; 34, 11, *eam rem*; XXVIII, 27, 6, *milites*. In 12 he writes *militastis* for *militatis*.

6. pp. 244-278. Th. Bergk and Th. Kock discuss (independently) the recently discovered fragments of Greek poets. (See Am. Jour. of Phil. I, p. 236.) The time has not yet come nor is this the place for attempting a summary of the attempts to restore the readings of these shattered texts. The *ῥήσις* which Weil and Blass have assigned to the Temenidae, Cobet to a satyric drama, Bergk now claims positively for the Cresphontes and Kock for the Archelaus. But this and other similar questions which these fragments have started are not ripe for concise statement.

7. pp. 279-286. F. Bücheler: The Apologists Aristides and Justin. A little book was published at Venice in 1878, in Armenian and Latin, with the title Sancti Aristidis philosophi Atheniensis sermones duo. B. examines the question how far these tracts can be referred to the Aristides who is mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome, and whom Justin is said to have imitated. One of the pieces has evidently nothing to do with Aristides; the other, which is very short, cannot have been his in anything like its present form. In this connection a number of critical remarks on Justin's Second Apology are offered. B. writes: II, 12, ἐμπέλασθαι, ὡς ἔλεγετε τὰ ἴσα. Farther on in the same chapter, εἰ δὲ καὶ νῦν τις ἦν, τραγικῇ φωνῇ ἂν ἐβόησεν, with a suggestion that perhaps *κἂν ὑμῖν* should be substituted for καὶ νῦν.¹ II, 15, B. protests against Leutsch's change, Ἀρχεστρατείους for ὀρχηστικοῖς. But surely the connection calls for a proper name, and more weight should be given to the fact that the union of the names of Philainis and Archestratus was *traditional* and therefore presumably familiar, at all events not likely to be obscure to anybody who could follow the reasoning of the Apology. The objection that the actual book of Archestratus was not a popular one at the time would seem to apply with equal force to the name of Philainis.² In the same chapter B. writes καὶ γεινομένοις καὶ γεγραμμένοις. In II, 2 several interpolations are pointed out: ὃν Οὐρβικὸς ἐκολάσατο εἰς δεσμῶ ἐμβαλόντα τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον (after ἀνερωτήσαι).

8. pp. 287-297. F. Blass continues the communication of fragments from Greek poets. In 1879 the Berlin Museum acquired a quantity of torn bits of parchment from Egypt. Among these is a very small piece with parts of about a score of lines from Sappho. Graux decides that the writing belongs approximately to the eighth century. The restoration of entire lines is impossible. Some of the forms are important: . . γχροῖσθεις, οἶκ οὐτω, κάσλον, διάκηται, λῦπης (2 sing.), etc. A larger piece of these same parchments gives parts of fifty lines (two passages) of Euripides' Μελανίππη ἡ δεσμώτις, identified by a quotation in Stobaeus. Graux refers the writing to the fourth century. B. with the aid of Weil, attempts a restoration of the broken verses, and then discusses the plot of the play with the aid of this new material.

¹ B. translates νῦν *auf Erden hier*, and understands with τις the words ἐπόπτης δίκαιος from the previous sentence. Justin would not have risked the implied limitation of God's power. *κἂν ὑμῖν* is much better. B. L. G.

² Bernhardt in his Gr. Lit. Geschichte II 2, p. 550, also remonstrates against von Leutsch's conjecture on the ground that it does gross injustice to Archestratos thus to couple him with the notorious Philainis, whose name, by the way, as a type occurs repeatedly in Martial. Unfortunately they are so coupled by Chrysippos ap. Athen. 8, 13, p. 336 D: βιβλία τὰ τε Φιλανίδος καὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἀρχεστράτου Γαστρονομίαν—a passage echoed by Athenaios himself 10, 86, p. 457 D: κομῶν γὰρ ἐστὶ ταῦτά γε τινὸς τοῖς Φιλανίδος καὶ τοῖς Ἀρχεστράτου συγγράμμασιν ἐνφωκτότος. It is evident that to severe moralists Philainis and Archestratos represented different phases of the lust of the flesh. My Christian friend Justin doubtless had no personal acquaintance with the productions of these famous writers, had never seen a *σχῆμα* of the one nor read a recipe of the other. Justin was not a learned man in the proper sense of the word, but he certainly knew enough to make a literary allusion, and many of the lights of the second century knew little more. How many good people of my youth knew the name of Paul de Kock and nothing more, being wholly ignorant that there were numerous pseudo-de Kocks afloat? How many now quote Rabelais and Brillat-Savarin at first hand? Would it be a sheer impossibility to find *La physiologie du mariage* and *La physiologie du goût* cited side by side? The literary knowledge of Justin's time, I repeat, outside of a special class, was a mere sham. B. L. G.

9. pp. 298-301. A. Ludwich discusses Av-Av. 168 and proposes a transposition of words, thus: ἐρεῖ ταδί τις ὄρνις οὗτος ὁ Τελέας, or, ἐρεῖ ταδί τις οὗτος ὄρνις ὁ Τελέας.

10. pp. 301-305. K. J. Neumann discusses the time of Babrius. He recapitulates the reasoning by which Crusius (Leipz. Stud. II) has reached the conclusion that Babrius wrote in the third century of our era, and tries to answer the question who is meant by παῖ βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου in the second prooemium. He makes it seem very probable that this is Elagabalus.

11. pp. 305-309. K. Dziatzko offers several critical remarks on Plato's Laws. 775, E, he punctuates: ἀρχὴ γάρ, καὶ θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἰδρυμένη. "For the beginning, which also has its shrines as a divinity among men, etc." The divinity of Ἀρχή is shown by several citations. 856, E, κοινὸς δ' ἐστὶ τρίτους εἰς. 864, B, δόξης τῆς ἀμαθοῦς περὶ. 886, C, τὸ παράπαν δεόντως εἴρηται. In this connection D. gives a correction of C. F. W. Müller to 837, C, ἐρῶν, τῇ ψυχῇ δὲ ὁντως τῆς. 935, C, θυμῷ, ἐταίρω κακῷ. Epin. 990, C, δυνατόν ἐστι, χρεῶν. D. further defends the traditional text of 709, E, and offers new arguments in favor of old conjectures in other passages.

12. pp. 309-312. E. Rohde offers seventeen conjectural emendations of the tract περὶ ὕψους. A selection may be given: p. 15, 13 (Jahn), ὡς φῶρ ἰὸν τινος; p. 22, 5, ἐχορήγησε κάξέφηνεν; p. 49, 12, ἰδιωτεύει πω σημαντικῶς; p. 57, 3, τάχος, ὁ δὴ κύριον; p. 57, 4, θεόπεμπτα δὴ τινα δωρήματα; p. 61, 3, βέλεσιν, ὀρᾶς.

13. pp. 312-313. A. Stachelscheid gives the corrections Bentley had made in the margin of his copy of Virgil, now in the British Museum. No scratch of Bentley's pen can fail to interest the philologist; and I have thought it best to report these emendations almost without omissions. Two of those which I omit were published by Bentley himself in his lifetime. G. III, 114, insistere *rector*; III 120-122 after 96 as Ribbeck, following Tittler, has placed them. IV, 203-205 after 196, 236-238 after 230. Both these changes Schrader also proposed. Bentley's note makes it doubtful whether they were original with him. A. I, 429 decora *apta*, sed vide II, 448; II, 532, sanguine *fundit*; III, 674, *Trinacriae* curvisque; IV, 168, connubis; IV, 294, diverberet *auras*; VI, 862, delecto *nubila*; VII, 51, Bentley wrote the line: nulla fuit, prima moriens erepta iuventa; VII, 92, *hinc* et tum; VIII, 65, *Tuscis* caput *amnis*; VIII, 237, in *aversam*; VIII, 301, proles, *deus*; VIII, 408-9, femina *cui mos est* tolerare; IX, 22, *ea* sic; X, 386, furit *incautus*; X, 809, detonet *omnem*; XI, 171, *equitumque* exercitus, with a reference to 598; XI, 173, in *arvis*; XI, 659, *Thracia*; XI, 665, *deicit*, *fundit*; XII, 482, agmina *longa*; XII, 830, *et* germana. On a blank page at the end of the book Bentley made a table of the days occupied by the action of the Aeneid. S. gives further a few emendations of Bentley to Servius: E. VI, 9, *te sine* nihil altum; A. I, 56, ut a *Cassio*; IV, 694, a *Pratrina*, antiquo; VI, 725, *lucidum*, quod; IX, 79, fit *ficta* historia; IX, 291, participio *figuratum* Terentius; X, 797, *dextra* adsurgentis; XII, 568, ὁμολογοῦσιν χαλινὸν λαβεῖν.

14. pp. 313-317. O. Schmidt proposes and explains four emendations to Cicero: Ep. ad Att. XV, 3, 1, de *Montano* scripsi; XV, 4, 2, Saufeium *petis* celemus; Phil. I, 31, metu *veteranorum*; III, 28, possem *quod volui*, nec abiecte.

15. pp. 317-320. J. Klein discusses several inscriptions bearing the name Commodus, and tries to deduce from them the order and (in part) the duration of the offices held by a certain C. Julius Commodus Orfitianus under Antoninus Pius.

16. p. 320. Th. Aufrecht has a note on *maritus*. The formation is the same as that of *auritus*, etc., and the original meaning is determined by this analogy. In use the meaning has suffered a change comparable to that which *nubo* must have undergone before Tertullian could say *Pontificem Max. rursus nubere fas est*. The use of *maritus*, *maritare*, in connection with the marriage of the vine to the elm, etc., proves that *arbo*s and the names of the large trees (stems in *o* and *u*) must have been originally masculine in Latin.

J. H. WHEELER.

PHILOLOGUS. Göttingen. Vol. XXXIX, Part I.

This number, less valuable than usual, brings six essays of some length: by von Kleist on significance of Plato's Protagoras as example of scientific method; by Köstlin, on the text of various passages in C. Valerius Flaccus; by Unger on Polybios' account of the Gallic invasion of Italy; by Reuss on chronology of the times of the Diadochi; by Gladisch on the false tradition that connects Pythagoras with Egypt; and by Gilbert on the secretaries (*γραμματεῖς*) of the Athenian boulé.

Besides these, Müller gives, pp. 148-160, a continuation of his Report on the literature connected with Plotinus, going back as far as 1830. He speaks in warm praise of the account given by Kellner of Neoplatonism in his *Hellenismus und Christenthum*, 1866; and he describes the aim and method of his own recent edition of Plotinus' *Enneades*.

In two paragraphs, p. 90 and p. 130, the editor, von Leutsch, discusses the identity and the time of the Quintus Valerius Soranus mentioned by Cicero in *Orat.* III, 43. He corrects Teuffel's statement; and proves that this Soranus died some years before 708 a. n. c.

In textual criticism there is discussion of passages in Vergil, Ovid, Quintilian, Isidorus and Censorinus in Latin, and of Sextus Empiricus, Euripides, Plato and Demosthenes in Greek.

In Vergil, at pp. 173-175, Münscher tries by an elaborate study of the context to save from proposed change the text of the augury-scene in *Aen.* I 390-401. He argues that *reduces* in v. 397 means 'safe from danger,' and not 'brought back to former position.'

In Ovid, at pp. 175-178, Köstlein succeeds in destroying by one unhappy conjecture the poetical life of two beautiful passages in *Met.* IX 342 seq. and IX, 526. In *idem factura videbar* he denies the correctness of this use of *videbar*, and proposes to get rid of it in this fashion:

iterum factura—videbam,
namque aderam—vidit (Dryope) guttas.

Encouraged by this, he then attacks the like use of *videtur* in v. 526, and for the poet's line:

quid velit, ignorat: quicquid factura videtur
dispicet—

he gives as his own :

quid velit ignorat quicquid factura : videtur,
displicet.

What will be left of the grace and sparkle of poets' thoughts if such criticism as this invade the text? For two other conjectures, *somnia* for *omnia* in IX 488, and *si* for *di* in VIII 69, what he says is worthy of careful study.

In Quintilian, at pp. 181-2, Becker succeeds by an apt quotation from Verg. Aen. I 526 in establishing the correctness and meaning of the disputed text *propius audirent*, Inst. Or. X 1, 91. The short paper is very able.

As to Isidorus, Wagener, at pp. 178-80, proves by parallel passages, a point overlooked by Droysen, that his *Chronica* are taken largely from Eutropius.

As to Censorinus, Meuser, at pp. 180-1, makes some conjectural corrections to Hultsch's text of the fragment ascribed to him *de coeli portione*.

The hard lines of Valerius Flaccus are becoming for modern Latinists what the towns of the Low Countries used to be for the strategists of Europe, things of no great value in themselves, but admirable, as points of attack and defence, for displaying the skill of the assailant and the obstinacy of the defender. In a long essay, pp. 33-68, Köstlin brings forward conjectures and observations to a large number of disputed passages. In the main, K's criticism, though lacking in delicacy of taste, is thoughtful and prudent. While he sometimes blunders himself, he oftener succeeds in pointing out the blunders of the audacious Bährens. Of thirty-five passages discussed, only a few can be noted. In I 449 he changes *penderet* and *pingui* into *linqueret* and *tenui*. This is violent and unnecessary. Thilo's *perderet*, adopted by Nisard, gives the best sense with the least change. In VIII 8, the passage, feeble enough in itself, is made absurd by the amazing interpretation that converts *somni* into a god, with capital S, and *vestigia* into his shrine. In VI 238 he is right in defending the *non altior* of the MSS. against the *non tardior* of Heinsius; but the ground of his defence seems altogether wrong. *Abies—docilis—medios non altior ire per hostes* vv. 236-8, means simply that the spear, thus managed, did not go too high, not above the heads of enemies. Very beautiful, on the other hand, is in VII 551 the change of *in vellera in ipsa*, Nisard's *quin vellera, et ipsa*, into *in velleris, ipsa*, so as to make *velleris* depend on preceding *aspectu*. So too he is equally ingenious and right in changing the meaningless line, VIII 286, into

perque ratio supplex iterum vexilla magistris,

where by *vexilla* he understands the flags used for signalling orders through the fleet. Cf. Seneca Agam. 448 seq. Best of all is his correction, in II 201-2, of the impossible *ingens Thraca palus* into *angens Thraca palus*, with reference to the shallow Propontis, which hems in, as it were, the Thracian people. Very amusing is his defence of the text in VIII 230 *fessum Iunonia sustinet Hebe* against the wild absurdity of Bährens's conjecture *fessum Iuno iam destinat Hebae*. And he winds up his attack upon Bährens by a triumphant defence of the beautiful passage in II 556-564 against changes by which both beauty and sense would be destroyed. Here the method and the result of a sound conservative criticism are admirably exemplified. In conclusion, K. reasserts his own claim to have discovered and announced the practice of alliteration as an element in Latin poetry, and its value as a guide to criticism.

Polybius gives, II, cc. 17-35, the story of the Gallic invasion of Italy, first a rapid narration of events down to 225 B. C., and then a detailed account of the decisive years 225-222. For the latter part, his authority is admitted to have been the Roman, Fabius Pictor; but, for the former part, there has always been a question whether he followed Roman or Greek authorities, and, if Greek, who they were. On this question, Unger, as against Th. Mommsen, maintains, in a learned and clearly written essay, pp. 69-90, that his authorities were certainly not Roman, but Greek; and that furthermore, instead of following a single authority, Polybius compiled from two Greek authorities which are at times inconsistent with each other. The non-Roman origin of Polybius' statements about the earlier invasion is proved by the facts that he leaves out many highly colored stories of Roman victories, that the count of years is inconsistent with Roman chronology, and that the tone is often unfriendly to Rome and friendly to the barbarians. The further fact that Polybius compiled, and compiled carelessly, from two independent Greek authorities is proved by certain inconsistencies in the chronology and geography of the events recounted. This line of proof is worked out with spirit and insight. It leads to the conclusion that, for the first part of his narrative, Polybius followed Timaeus himself; but that, for the second part he followed Silenus of Kalakte, a friend and partisan of Hannibal, friendly to the Gauls, as allies of Carthage. The argument here is ingenious, but too slight to be fully convincing. According, then, to Unger's theory, the Gallic section of Polybius breaks into three distinct parts: (1) cc. 17-20, based on Timaeus; (2) cc. 21-23, 4, based on Silenus, and (3) cc. 23, 5-35, based on Fabius Pictor.

The tangled chronology of the obscure period between the death of Alexander and the end of his generals' wars, 323-306 B. C., has been the despair of successive historians. It is made once more the subject of a searching examination by Reuss, in his tedious and badly arranged essay on 'die Chronologie der Diadochenzeit,' pp. 91-112. In general, he disputes the conclusions of Unger, and maintains those of Droysen; and he strives to prove that Diodoros, our chief authority, in following his own authority, the correct and scrupulous Hieronymus of Cardia, treated questions of chronology with gross carelessness, fixing the beginnings of each year and the events of each year with utter lack of insight and of self-consistency. The proof is so badly worked out that it cannot be enjoyed, can hardly be understood, except by the few that have made special studies in this uninviting field of history. As interesting results of his argument, it may be noted that the authority of Cornelius Nepos, who drew directly and carefully from Hieronymus, is vindicated against the sneer of Unger; that the funeral-procession and burial of Alexander is put forward to at least the February of 321; that the death of Antipater took place not in 318 but in 319; that the death of Olympias must have preceded the death of Eumenes, and that Eumenes himself died, not in 315, but on 20th January 316.

The number, the mode of appointment and the duties of the Athenian secretaries (*γραμματεῖς*) is the subject of a somewhat confused essay by Gilbert, pp. 131-147. His facts are taken from the Attic Inscriptions, brought down to the latest discoveries. His argument is directed against certain parts of Böckh's theory, as adopted by Schömann and upheld in later treatises by Schäfer and Hille. The theory of Böckh is founded upon the direct statement of Pollux,

supposed to be taken from a lost work of Aristotle. But Gilbert shows that the statement of Pollux, in this part, is opposed to the facts revealed in the inscriptions, and that, instead of coming from Aristotle, it comes from a misunderstanding of Demosthenes XXIV 42 and 63. According to Gilbert's own view, ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς was one and the same officer with ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν. The one or the other title was used, even in the same document, according to the circumstances of the case. He was appointed, probably not by lot but by election, for a month at a time, and from a phylé that did not hold the prytany for that month. But, as he could be re-elected, he might be continued in office indefinitely. His duties were the recording and publication of public documents, and the care of the state-archives. He was aided in his duties by ὑπογραμματεῖς. This system lasted down to 322 B. C. From that time on to the end of the century, there was another independent officer, called ἀναγραφεὺς, charged specially with the record, by inscriptions, etc., of public documents. After that, the system of one γραμματεὺς, called γρ. τοῦ δήμου, lasted on into Roman times. The existence of a third secretary, as stated by Pollux, with the sole function of reading documents before the δῆμος, cannot be proved and is not probable. (See below, p. 137).

In Greek criticism, it is proved by Schanz, p. 32, that in Sextus Empiricus, Codex C. (Cizensis), used by Bekker in his edition, is only a bad copy of Codex R. (Regiomontanus), without critical value.

In Euripides, Vitelli, at p. 164, proposes a new plan for getting rid of the old trouble in Med. vv. 11-12. He changes τέκνοισιν ἀνδάνουσα μὲν into τέκνοις χάνδάνουσα μὲν, and takes the ὦν after πολιτῶν as possessive, instead of relative, pronoun. He overlooks the fact, which is fatal to his interpretation, that the words form part of the unreal apodosis. The nurse is picturing not what is, but what might have been, had not the Argo sailed.

In Plato, Liebhöf, at pp. 165-170, proposes ten changes of text in books VIII and X of the Republic. Of these some are plausible; others are warning examples of unwise tampering with the words and thoughts of a great writer. In VIII 543, B, the change from οἶαι ἔσονται αὐτοῖς to ὅτι κοιναὶ ἔσονται αὐτοῖς is needless and disfiguring. It involves the confusion, so common among German critics, of the relative with the interrogative clause. Very bad too is the proposed change in VIII 544, D, of ἀνθρώπων εἶδη τσαῦτα τρόπων—ὥσπερ καὶ πολιτειῶν to ἀνθρώπων εἶδη καὶ τρόπων. This destroys the balance of the sentence, and the parallelism of τρόπων and πολιτειῶν both limited by the preceding ἀνθρώπων. In VIII 566, C, he gravely proposes to destroy the witty innuendo of Plato's οὐ γὰρ ἂν δεύτερον αὖθις αἰδεσθεῖν by changing αἰδεσθεῖν into οἰκισθεῖν! In X 601, C, in proposing to change ἡμίσεως into μιμίσεως, he raises the old question whether the form ἡμίσεως as genitive exists in Attic. In X 675, A, he is probably right in restoring the δεῖ which, though needed for the sense, has fallen out before διηγῆσθαι. In X 609, C, the change of the unmeaning ὧδε ποιεῖ into ὧδε πονοῖε gives a good sense by a small change of text. In VIII 551, C, he succeeds by minute changes in converting loose, conversational sentences into closely knit grammatical ones; but this looseness in grammar is often part of Plato's dramatic method. His best conjecture is made in respect of the famous passage in VIII 550, E, ὥσπερ—ρέποντα. The ῥέποντα, already changed by Madvig into ῥέποντε, he now changes into ῥέπουσα, so as to agree

with ἀρετή. This brings out the conditional force of the participle as apodosis to κειμένον ἐκατέρων. By one change more, by restoring the ἄν dropt out after τοῖναντίον, the construction and the sense would become altogether free from perplexity.

In Demosthenes, Wecklein, at pp. 170-173, gives us four suggestions that seem the most valuable part of this number of the Philologus. In VIII § 22, by the apt comparison of Soph. El. 678, he so changes the interpretation, without touching the text, as to make the sense much richer and more appropriate. οὔτε τὰ ἡμέτερ' αὐτῶν πράττειν ἐθέλομεν means, he argues, 'we are not willing to mind our own affairs' = 'we are not willing to give up foreign politics, to be content with political insignificance in Greece.' The context makes this sense almost certain. In VI § 16, from the reading τοῖς ἐκείνων ἐχθροῖς συνεχῶς ἐναντιοῦσθαι he proposes to drop the ἐχθροῖς as repeated from § 15. By this we gain the true view of Philip's selfish policy as denounced by Dem. He means, 'in spite of present appearances, I do not at all believe that Philip will be permanently hostile to the interests of the Thebans.' By this change the obscure passage becomes luminous in meaning. In IV 43, πάντ' ἔχιν οἶεσθε καλῶς, again by comparing Soph. Ant. 498 and Eur. Med. 570, he proposes to improve both sense and construction by leaving out καλῶς. Here both turns of thought are so good that Dem. might well have used either: there seems no adequate reason for the change. Finally, in VIII 62, ὅσα τοῖς Ὀλυνθίοις πρότερον δοῖς Ποτίδαιαν ἐξηπάτησε καὶ πόλλ' ἕτερα, he proposes to leave out, as a foolish gloss, Ποτίδαιαν καὶ π. ε. The ὅσα is object not to ἐξηπάτησε but to δοῖς. Both sense and balance of construction require that Dem. should lay stress not on the magnitude of the deception, but on the magnitude of the gifts by which the deception was accomplished. Here Wecklein has evidently hit the truth and gives us back Demosthenes' own thought. These four criticisms show the hand of a master.

In Plato's Protagoras, the apparent inconsistency between Socrates' argument against the possibility of teaching ἀρετή and the Socratic doctrine as presented in Gorgias and elsewhere, has long distressed students of Platonism. On this point, von Kleist, in advocacy of Bonitz's theory, now comes forward with a long essay, pp. 1-32, often obscure and over-subtle, but rich in thought and suggestion. According to him, the Protagoras is not ethical at all, nor designed to establish any objective truth on the point discussed, but an essay in cunning dialectics, designed to teach by examples the difference between true and false logic in research. Its value is, therefore, as evidence of Plato's knowledge of the formal logic. The superiority of Socrates over Protagoras is seen in the ability of the one, the inability of the other, to use either the inductive or the deductive method with formal correctness. Full of interest and even of fun is the picture of Socrates' skill in using the syllogism, in fallacious forms of undistributed middle, to bewilder his unskilful adversary. Socrates is shown to be a perfect master in the logical arts of forming definitions and framing syllogisms. The truth or falsehood of the views expressed by the great debaters is matter of indifference; the accuracy of Socrates, and the shuffling inaccuracy of Protagoras, in the processes of reasoning are used by Plato to demonstrate the superiority of the Socratic method over those of the pretentious sophists.

Against the old traditions that connect the name of Pythagoras with the 'wisdom of the Egyptians,' as the disciple of Egyptian sages, and the disseminator of Egyptian doctrines, Gladisch makes, pp. 113-130, an earnest and very learned protest in his essay 'die Aegyptische Entstellung des Pythagoras.' He is the author of that singular book *Die alten Chinesen und die Pythagoreer*, 1865, and he leads this essay up to the support of his whim that, since Pythagoras did not draw his doctrine from Egypt, he drew it from China, along the great caravan-route through Central Asia. But, in spite of this hobby-riding, the essay is full of interest and of value. False traditions, according to his view, grew up in later ages as to the origin and nature of Pythagoras' doctrines from a wide-spread confusion of Pythagoras with Empedocles. Thus, as against Zeller, Gladisch tries to prove, by the authority of Aristoxenos of Tarentum, who represents the genuine tradition of the real Pythagoras, that the doctrine of transmigration of souls was never taught by Pythagoras at all, but by Empedocles. So too the avoidance of animal food formed no part of either the doctrine or the practice of Pythagoras. Very curious is the proof afforded by the advance of Aegyptology that the peculiar tenets of Pythagoras, the significance of numbers and of music as symbols of the cosmic harmony, were not contained in the system of Egyptian philosophy. Curious, if not convincing, is the attempted derivation of these doctrines from the ancient philosophic literature of the Chinese. According to Gladisch, the followers of Pythagoras were divided in the philosophic language of the Greeks into three classes, *Πυθαγόρειοι*, *Πυθαγορικοί* and *Πυθαγορισται*. The first were the true disciples of Pythagoras himself: the second and third classes were the followers of Empedocles, who exaggerated his doctrine of transmigration and of vegetarianism into the form that excited the laugh of the later comedy. Aristotle, for example, speaks with contempt of *Πυθαγορικοί*, but with reverence of *Πυθαγόρειοι*. If Gladisch be right (p. 119), we have to reconstruct our ideas of history so far as to take into our minds a Pythagoras who, so far from forbidding the eating of beans, was uncommonly fond of them, and who, so far from eschewing all flesh, was especially addicted to the enjoyment of shote.

THOS. R. PRICE.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOLOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK. Fleckeisen und Masius. 1880.

I.

I. (1-22) The composition of the groups in the Aeginetan Pediments by Docent L. Julius of Munich. C. Lange (see *Am. Jour. Phil.* I 374) endeavored to show that there were originally two additional standing spearmen in each pediment, and that to the moisture of the earth, after the statues had fallen, was to be ascribed the corrosion on which great stress had been laid as determining which side had been exposed to the weather and thus to which pediment the statue belonged, the situation of the statue in the pediment as well as the connection of fragments. J. calls attention to the effect of the weather on the sculptures of the Theseum and Parthenon, of which the latter, like the Aeginetan, are of Parian marble. Moreover, as the statues were buried three

feet deep they should have been affected by the earth equally on all sides. All the peculiarities of corrosion can be explained by the protection afforded by other statues or other parts of the same statue, by their inclination toward the roof or the wall of the pediment. Moreover, the space does not allow of the addition of the proposed two figures. The fragments which cannot be assigned to any of the statues of the group as now constituted, may have belonged to statues which stood near the temple. A catalogue is given of the fragments in the Munich Museum.

2. (22-24) Professor Rohde of Tübingen points out from Simplicius that the story of an eagle dropping a tortoise upon a bald man's head was as old as Democritus. R. supposes this to have been transferred to Aeschylus simply because of the poet's baldness.

3. (24-26) A. Daub of Freiburg offers emendations to Suidas' dates in the lives of Anaximenes and Anacreon.

4. (27-31) Professor Hultsch of Dresden determines the worth of the denarius of Diocletian, the standard of prices in the emperor's edict in 301 de pretiis rerum venalium, as equal to .02538 mark or 3.133 centimes. There were 36000 denarii to the gold pound as 36000 obols in a talent.

5. (31-32) Professor E. A. Richter of Altenburg desires to read *aperte* for *ante* in Cicero de imperio Cn. Pompeii, 13, 37.

6. (33-34) Notice by Professor E. Petersen (Prague) of Curtius' The Excavations at Olympia III. The work and discoveries of the winter and spring, 1877-78.

7. (44-48) Docent Conrad Lacher of Halle rejects Clemm's etymology of *προνσελέω* (Aesch. Prom. 437, Arist. Frogs 730) from *προ-εσ-ελέω* (= *εἰλέω*), and supposes from the root *par* (*πορεύω*) to be derived fuller forms *pru*, *prus*, meaning *penetrating* (cf. *διαπρίσσις*), **προνσελος*, *painful*. Thence *προνσελέω*.

8. (49-69) Critical notice by Professor R. Förster (Rostock) of Gardthausen's Greek Palaeography.

9. (69-70) H. Rönsch of Lobenstein presents evidence from the Itala of the loss of final *t* in verb-forms.

10. (71-80) Professor A. Eussner of Würzburg gives a commendatory notice of Ulrich's *Commentatio de vita et honoribus Taciti*.

II.

11. (81-106) Protagorea, by H. Müller-Strübing of London. In Aristoph. Birds 1072, the interpreters generally have understood by *Διαγόραν τὸν Μῆλιον*, the well-known atheist who was the contemporary of Pindar and Bacchylides. But he had left Athens and had been put under the ban long before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war. In the Birds, reference must be made to some one whom the name of Diagoras would call to the mind of every spectator. This was Protagoras. The accepted belief that he was driven from Athens during the rule of the Four Hundred rests solely upon an unnecessary interpretation of Diogenes Laertius. The Four Hundred had more than enough to do with the things of this world; they had no time to concern themselves with

philosophers and their theories *περὶ τῶν θεῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν μεταρσίων*. (The case of Socrates and the Thirty was different.) In 415 the Athenians were at actual peace. *Διαγόρας ὁ Μήλιος* had become a generic name for atheist, as is shown by Aristophanes' expression *Σωκράτης ὁ Μήλιος* (Clouds 835). This same generic name, M-S believes, was here applied to Protagoras, but the original text was not understood and was corrected. *Πρωταγόρας ὁ Μήλιος* would be too simple an emendation. That hardly could have confused a copyist and would have been looked upon by the spectators as a worn-out joke. We may conjecture that the poet wrote *Διαγόραν τὸν Τήιον*, as Eupolis called Protagoras *Τήιος*, (and we may trust Eupolis that there was some good joke in assigning him to that island; the very use of the epithet shows that this was not his real home, as the comic poets add this designation only to prevent confusion). Of course the grammarians would leave uncorrected no such obvious blunder as *Διαγ. τὸν Τήιον* would seem to them; hence our present text. On the strength of this altered text, the text of Diodorus, or even of Ephorus whom he followed, may have been changed, for in Diod. Sic. XIII, 6, Diagoras, as Fritzsche rightly conjectures, is confounded with Protagoras. M-S also considers it probable that Protagoras is meant by Aristagoras, Schol. on Clouds 830. Remarks follow on the ridicule of the mysteries by the *ἐρμοκοπίδαι*, and on the parody on all religious ceremonies in the Birds where Pallas seems to be intended by the *βασίλεια*.

12. (106-108) Professor H. Flach of Tübingen. One word more on Suidas' lists of the Sibyls.

13. (108-112) Notice by Professor Menge (Gross-Glogau) of Heiberg's Quaestiones Archimedeae; a dissertation which authorizes the confident expectation that the edition of Archimedes which Heiberg is preparing will satisfy the demands of modern philology.

14. (113-119) J. H. C. Schubart of Capel opposes the view that *ἀγαλμα* Paus. VII 5, 5, could mean a *raft* and not the god's statue. In Paus. I 27, 4, S. would read *Εὐήρις* and *Λυσιμάχη*. This statuette is not identical with the statue by Demetrius mentioned by Pliny XXXIV 76.

15. (119-120) Richard Arnoldt of Königsberg offers three conjectural emendations to Julian's orations.

16. (120) F. Rühl of Königsberg reads *Φιλαδέλφον καλουμένον* for *Φ. καὶ* in Athen. V 196 A.

17. (121) Marginalia to Plautus' Curculio by Emil Baehrens of Groningen. To these are added (121-124) other notes on the same play by Professor Fleck-eisen of Dresden.

18. (125-135) K. P. Schulze of Berlin reviews Catullus rec. Ellis, 1878.

19. (135) Max Nietzki of Königsberg in Catullus LV 11 fg. reads *nudum sinum recludens*.

20. (136) W. H. Roscher of Meissen in Caesar's Bellum Civile III 32, 3 inserts *singuli* after *singulis*.

21. (137-147) W. Friedrich of Mühlhausen on Cicero's Brutus and Orator.

22. (147-148) Professor Rühl of Königsberg opposes the view of Mommsen (see *Am. Jour. Phil.* I 380) that Porcia, the famed wife of M. Brutus, was not the daughter but the wife of Cato Uticensis, and was already fifty years old when she married Brutus. The testimony as to her father is unanimous. She may have contracted her marriage with Bibulus at an early age, as was not infrequent at Rome. Then when she married Brutus she would be not fifty but at most thirty years old, cf. *Plut. Brut.* XIII κόρη οὖσαν ἐτι.

23. (149-152) Professor Dombart of Erlangen makes critical remarks to three passages in his edition of Augustine, *de civitate dei*.

The paedagogical section of this number contains (65-78) an essay by Professor Conrad Hermann of Leipzig (son of Gottfried Hermann) in opposition to the prevailing view that ancient verse can be understood only from the standpoint of rhythmic. The relation of the artistic metrical form of the language to the rhythmic musical accompaniment was not the same in antiquity as in our time. As we succeed better in painting and music, so the ancients were more successful in sculpture and verse-formation, for which the climate and the language were with them most favorable. The metrical accent or verse-ictus is originally nothing but the common word-accent, and it is absolutely false to confound this with musical pitch which regularly and organically had nothing to do with language. The interrogative raising of the voice is an exception. Syllables may be longer or shorter, louder or softer, but not, in language, of higher or lower pitch, which belongs specifically to music in distinction from speech. The rhythmical element is considered in the purely metrical construction of the strophe; there is also an agreement between metrical and musical rhythm, brought about by the principle of pauses and of lengthening long and shortening short syllables. But the musical rhythm is only accessory to the metrical form which is decisive in every strophic composition. Hermann ends as he began with his father's words: *Metricam artem nondum satis esse explicatam*.

III.

24. (153-178) Professor O. Schneider of Gotha († Mar. 28, 1880). Twenty Emendations to Aristophanes. *E. g.* *Achar.* 25 ἔθοντες for ἐλθόντες. *Thesm.* 24 προσμάθου (rarer form of the optative) μή for προσμάθοιμι. 236 ἐκκύψας for ἐγκύψας. 239 ἐτι κύπτε for ἐπικύπτε. *Clouds* 963 φωνὴν γρύζοντος μηδὲν ἀκοῦσαι | ἐν ταῖσιν ὁδοῖς· εἰτα βαδίζειν εὐτάκτως . . | τοὺς κωμήτας ἀνθρώπους γυμνοῦς.

25. (178-182) Professor E. Hiller of Halle, on the Birds of Aristophanes. τὴν ὁδὸν ταύτην, 12, refers to the path on which Euelpides had just suffered a tumble. The four single birds which appear 267-286, probably to serve as musicians, are adorned with crests (291 ἡ λόφος ἡ τῶν ὀρνέων) and may be supposed to have occupied elevated positions (cf. ὀροβάτης) which in jest were called λόφοι (cf. 279) with punning reference to the plumed crests which they wore.

26. (182-184) Dr. Th. Büttner-Wobst of Dresden would read in Gellius IV 1, 1 Grammaticae rei *peritior* (for *ditor*) (cf. XVI 10, 2 Grammaticae rei *peritior*). XIII 15 magistratus *ratus et iustus* for magistratus set iustus (cf. *Cic. de leg.* III 3 quodque is qui bellum geret imperasset, ius ratumque esto). XIII 16, 1 nec avocare ab eo alii possunt, si contionem habere volunt, uti ne cum populo *agat*.

27. (184) Dr. Heinr. Deiter of Emden gives the gleanings from a new collation of the Leyden codex Vossianus 86 of Martial.

28. (185-188) Professor A. von Gutschmid of Tübingen reviews Studies on the History of Semitic Religions by Wolf Wilhelm Graf Baudissin. Second part, Leipzig, 1878. The author is highly praised for his learning, caution, freedom from prejudice, reliability of citations, strictly methodical criticism, clear statement of the problems and results. The first essay is on the Old Testament idea of holiness. *Qôdesh* means properly *separate* (from what is common and unclean). The second essay is on holy waters, trees and hills among the Semitic races. These races saw in fountains and rivers only a figure of the life-giving power of the heavenly gods. Even the Phœnician worship of Poseidon he does not consider an exception. So in Melikertes he sees only the sun-god ruling over the sea. So he considers Dagon as perhaps a god of the sky, and later (though at an early period) transferred to the sea. So the trees are a manifestation of the life-power *in* the earth proceeding from the divinity *above* the earth. The sanctity of hills and mountains points most directly to the celestial nature of the Semitic gods.

29. (189-202) Dr. F. v. Stojentin of Breslau. The Senate's *γραμματεῖς* and the *ἀντιγραφεὺς* in Pollux and Harpocration. He calls attention to the danger of neglecting the grammarians' statements, though the material of the C. I. A. saves from some errors which were inevitable to Boeckh. S. insists on three clerks: *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*, — *τῆς πόλεως*, — *κατὰ πρυτανείαν*. (See above, p. 131).

30. (203-216) Dr. Theod. Opitz of Dresden. Critical notes on the text of Florus. O. supports the authority of the Jordanis and Nazarianus codices against the Bamberg. Dr. Meiser of Munich adds four conjectures to Florus and considers how far proper names with Greek case endings are to be admitted.

IV.

31. (217-230) Docent Karl Brugman of Leipzig on the verb *φέρω* which Nauck derives from *προίημι*, Curtius from root *bher* (φερ). Rejecting the former's root and the latter's arguments B. sets out from *bher*, to carry, and thus explains *ἐσπιφράναι*, *ἐκφῆρται* κτλ., also an aor. ind. *ἔφρην*. Since this verb in meaning is much like the entirely distinct *ἵημι* (e. g. *εἰσῆμι* almost equals *εἰσφέρω*) the two words were confused, and after the analogy of *ἵημι* the forms *φρές*, *φρέσθαι* κτλ. were created. Parallel examples are given from the German, and we are reminded of *ἡρίσταμεν* and *ἄριστάναι* which the Attic comic poets used for *ἡριστήκαμεν* κτλ.

32. (231-247) Dr. A. Viertel of Königsberg on Petrarch's discovery of Cicero's letters. V. and Professor Voigt of Leipzig had written simultaneously against the hitherto prevailing view that Petrarch discovered both collections of letters, the letters to Brutus, Quintus and Atticus, at Verona in 1345, and later the letters *ad familiares* at Vercelli. Voigt and Viertel agree that Petrarch found only the first collection and was ignorant of the other's existence. Hence the copy thought to be in Petrarch's handwriting, in the Laurentian library at Florence, cannot be his, and thus falls the evidence for P.'s hand in the other collection. As citations from Cicero's letters are found in some of Petrarch's letters which were written surely before 1345, and as the date of the discovery

is fixed by P. himself, it is probable that P.'s letters were revised and rewritten. The suggestion is offered that the *situations* in some of the letters are wholly fictitious. Especially may this be true with regard to the letter relating his discussion in Vicenza concerning Cicero. For the criticism of the text is noteworthy the view that, besides the Veronese archetype of C.'s letters, there existed another MS, from which the gaps of the Mediceus were filled, containing the letters to Brutus and Quintus and seven or eight books of the letters to Atticus. This Bruni must have applied to the correction of the Mediceus. These probably are the corrections marked *al.*

33. (247) Emil Glaser of Giessen cites Propertius III 32, 59 fg. 73 fg. and Apuleius Apol. X to show that Vergil's second eclogue was not intended as a simple Theocritean study nor as a poem of serious love.

34. (248) Professor J. Arnoldt of Gumbinnen would 'bracket' *fatali* in Velleius II 49, 1 (or 48, 6).

35. (249-253) Professor Moriz Schmidt of Jena on the tenth Satire of Horace's first book. H.'s satires had to meet a threefold attack. Some, accustomed to the artistic imitation of Greek models, doubted whether this unpretending chit-chat, though in hexameter verse, had a right to the name of poetry. Others called the poet a *lividus*, *mordax*, *niger*, who to raise a laugh would put his best friend in the stocks. But while H. went too far to please this second class of critics, he did not go far enough for the *aretalogi*. To defend himself against these was the end and occasion of our satire. Analyzing the satire we see that verses 1-19 belong together, so 38-72, so 73-142, but there is no real connection between these last mentioned sections. The connection of 20-37 is still more obscure. The following order is confidently proposed: 1-19, 38-72, 29-37, 20, 24-28, 21-23, 73-142. Then the last 105 verses are in the best of order (emending 20 and 25) and the poet himself is speaking as in 1-19. But two words, *quid tu?* are left for the *aliquis* of 19. The misplacement in our MSS. of 20-37 indicates an original MS. of which each page contained nine hexameters divided in two columns. We may suppose that one leaf and thus eighteen verses have been lost which Horace put into the mouth of the *aliquis*.

36. (259-263) Professor A. Riese of Frankfurt adds to the MSS. collations in his edition of the Anthologia Latina.

37. (263-264) Professor Hultsch of Dresden remarks that in his Metrologici Scriptores II, p. 52 (Varro de re rustica) we should read *haec posita* (for *postea*) *centum centuria*, and it is noted that in all likelihood Varro's centuria (2400 feet square) was the normal measure for the Roman camp as described by Polybius, and no less for the camp of the imperial period.

38. (265-288) Emil Baehrens of Groningen, Studies in the Germania of Tacitus. After seven pages on the MS. foundation of our text (he is convinced that the Hummelianus is a direct copy by a German hand of the old Herzfeld [or Fulda] archetype) follow emendations.

39. (288) Professor Hultsch on the Fragmentum Censorino adscriptum.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

ARCHIV FÜR MITTEL- U. NEUGRIECHISCHE PHILOLOGIE. Herausgegeben von
MICHAEL DEFFNER. Athen, 1880. 25fr.

I desire to call especial attention to this publication, which is in the editorial care of Professor Deffner of the University of Athens, who has done so much for Greek dialectology, and whose studies of the Tsakonian dialect, a variant of the greatest interest to the philologist, constitute the most important part of this volume of the 'Archiv.' The simple story of Professor Deffner's heroic work for the last eleven years—his 'Neo-graeca' bears date 1871—touches other than philological chords and gives this volume a pathetic interest. While much space is yielded to linguistic, the scope of the 'Archiv' is wide, and embraces the whole life of Greece for the medieval and modern period. A detailed account of the 'Archiv' promised by a contributor to this journal has failed to reach me in time for this issue, and I wish it were in my power to make up by emphasis for the brevity of this notice, as the fate of the 'Archiv' may depend on the interest evoked among the friends of Hellenic philology outside of Greece. In the disturbed condition of the kingdom, help cannot be expected from the government, with its resources taxed to the utmost by the recent preparations for war. It would be a noble use of money, if some American Philhellenist would at once secure the pecuniary support of the undertaking.

B. L. G.